## **CLIFFORD J. BAKER**

ATTORNEY AT LAW
[California Bar #121311]

4200 Park Blvd., Suite 132 '99 APR 15 P 2:03 Oakland, CA 94602-1312 (510) 482-2357 Fax: (510) 482-2357

December 3, 1998

Dockets Management Branch (HFA-305) Food and Drug Administration 5630 Fishers Lane, Room 1061 Rockville, Maryland 20852

Re: Docket # 98N-1038, "Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Food"

To whom it may concern:

The FDA should retain the current labeling law, the current terminology of "treated with radiation" or "treated by irradiation," and the use of the radura symbol on all irradiated whole foods.

Regarding the issue of labeling, in its initial petition, the FDA concluded that irradiation was a "material fact" about the processing of a food, and thus should be disclosed. The material fact remains; therefore, labeling should remain. Consumer acceptability, storage qualities and nutrients are affected. Some irradiated foods have different texture and spoilage characteristics than untreated foods. Most fruits and vegetables have nutrient losses that are not obvious or expected by the consumer.

In addition, processing by irradiation causes chemical changes that are not evident and are potentially hazardous. Meat may have a higher level of carcinogenic benzene. All irradiated foods contain unique radiolytic products that have never been tested.

Whether or not the FDA has approved irradiation as safe, it remains a new technology with no long-term human feeding studies. Consumers certainly have a right to know if this process has been used on their food.

As to the kind of label used, I believe that label should be large enough to be readily visible to the consumer, on the front of the package. The label contains important information regarding the processing of the contents. For displayed whole foods such as produce, a

C659

prominent informational display similar to that used for meats should be used (but containing the term "irradiation" and the radura).

I am tired of large corporate interests trying to deceive the public about the products that they sell us. I am tired of corporate interests playing with our food, with no concern about our health or well being. Most of all, I am tired of the very governmental agencies that we look to to protect us bending over backwards to let these corporate interests do this to us.

We, the public, have, at the very least, the right to know what is done to our food, and the right to make purchasing decisions based upon having all information about that food made available to us. This is worse than the battle over "organic" labeling that we fought last summer.

Because of the newness of the technology and the need to assess the public health effects of widespread use of irradiated foods, I believe that the FDA's labeling requirement should not be permitted to expire. If you will not do your job to protect us from such tampering with our food, at least you should have the decency to let us be informed about which foods a re tampered with, so that we can make our shopping and eating decisions accordingly.

Very truly yours,

Zlifford J. Baker

CJB:pc

## **CLIFFORD J. BAKER**

ATTORNEY AT LAW

[California Bar #121311]

4200 Park Blvd., Suite 132 6 '99 APR 15 P 2:05 Oakland, CA 94602-1312 (510) 482-2357 Fax: (510) 482-2357

April 12, 1999

Dockets Management Branch (HFA-305) Food and Drug Administration 5630 Fishers Lane, Room 1061 Rockville, Maryland 20852

Re: Docket No. 98N-1038, Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Food

To whom it may concern:

I support the recommendation by the Center for Science in the Public Interest regarding labeling of irradiated foods:

"any foods, or any foods containing ingredients that have been treated by irradiation, should be labeled with a written statement on the principal display panel indicating such treatment. The statement should be easy to read and placed in close proximity to the name of the food and accompanied by the international symbol. If the food is unpackaged, this information should be clearly displayed on a poster in plain view and adjacent to where the product is displayed for sale."

Like other labels, irradiation labels are required by FDA to be truthful and not misleading. I believe that the terms "treated with radiation" or "treated by irradiation" should be retained. Any phrase involving the word "pasteurization" is misleading because pasteurization, as you are certainly well aware, is an entirely different process of rapid heating and cooling.

I recognize the radura as information regarding a material fact of food processing. The requirement for irradiation disclosure (both label and radura) should not expire at any time in the future. The material fact of processing remains. Even if some consumers become familiar

with the radura, new consumers (e.g., young people, immigrants) will not be. The symbol should be clearly understandable at the point of purchase for every one. If there is no label, consumers will be misled into believing the food has not been irradiated.

I am tired of large corporate interests trying to deceive the public about the products that they sell us. I am tired of corporate interests playing with our food, with no concern about our health or well being. Most of all, I am tired of the very governmental agencies that we look to to protect us bending over backwards to let these corporate interests do this to us.

We, the public, have, at the very least, the right to know what is done to our food, and the right to make purchasing decisions based upon having all information about that food made available to us. This is worse than the battle over "organic" labeling that we fought last summer.

Finally, I urge you to place the comments received on the Internet so that the public can be informed about who is participating in this comment process.

Very truly yours,

Littord J. Baker

CJB:pc

Clifford J. Baker, Esq. 4200 Park Blvd., Suite 132 Oakland, CA 94602





Dockets Management Branch (HFA-305) Food and Drug Administration 5630 Fishers Lane, Room 1061 Rockville, Maryland 20852

20057/0001

Labilia de de la la labilia de labilia de la labilia de la labilia de labilia de la labilia de labilia de la labilia de labilia de labilia de la labilia de labilia de labilia de la labilia de la labilia de labili